

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application, containing is being presented as a new formal drawing sheet. Figure 4C, a schematic drawing of waveguide tubes in a dielectric board, has been added to illustrate features recited in claim 4, as requested by the Examiner.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-14 are currently amended. After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-14 are now pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

Specification Objections

Applicants acknowledge the objections of specification, and have amended paragraphs on pages 2, 4, 9-10, 14, and 16 accordingly. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections set forth in this Office Action in view of above amendments.

Drawing Objections under 37 CFR 1.83 (a)

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83 (a). By way of this reply, Figure 4C is added to illustrate features recited in claim 4, as requested by the Examiner. A brief description of Figure 4C is added to Brief Description section of the Specification.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections set forth in this Office Action in view of above amendments.

Claim Rejections under 35 U. S. C. § 112

Claims 4-7, 8, 10-14, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-14 are amended in a non-limiting way to address the issues raised by the Examiner. For example, the term “feed side waveguide” is replaced by “main feeder line”, the term “branch waveguide” is replaced by “branch feeder line”, and the term “formed” is replaced with “provided”. Support for above amendments can be found throughout the specification, for example, in the paragraph starting at page 9, line 14. No new matter is added. Thus, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections set forth in this Office Action in view of above amendments.

Claim Rejections under 35 U. S. C. § 102 (as being anticipated by Vlietstra et al)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Vlietstra et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,390,355).

Claim 1 is amended to recite “a feeder waveguide that is configured to achieve *point-to-multipoint communication*” and “a plurality of selection structures, wherein each section structure is configured to selectively cut off one of the plurality of branch feeder lines, *independently of the other branch feeder lines*”. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, for example, in the paragraphs starting at page 4, line 11, and starting at page 9, line 22. No new matter is added.

Vlieststra discloses a feeder waveguide comprising three waveguides (11, 12, 13) arranged with a waveguide switch. The first, second, and third waveguide passages passing normally inwardly from the flat faces of said body respectively to intersect in the central portion of said body at angles of 120° with respect to each other (Figure 1, and C2/L10-24). As the Examiner pointed out, the waveguide switch can selectively cause electromagnetic energy to flow from the feed waveguide to one of the branch waveguide depending on the position of the conductive vane defined by conductive plates in the waveguide switch, ***which cut off the other branch waveguide from received the electromagnetic energy.*** (Emphasis supplied.)

Thus, Vlieststra fails to disclose either “a feeder waveguide that is configured to achieve *point-to-multipoint communication*” or “a plurality of selection structures, wherein each section structure is configured to selectively cut off one of the plurality of branch feeder lines, *independently of the other branch feeder lines*”, as recited in currently amended claim 1.

Claim Rejections under 35 U. S. C. § 102 (as being anticipated by Hershberger et al)

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Hershberger et al (U.S. Patent No. 2,415,242).

Claim 2 is amended to recite “a feeder waveguide that is configured to achieve *point-to-multipoint communication*” and “a plurality of selection structures, wherein each section structure is configured to selectively cut off one of the plurality of branch feeder lines, *independently of the other branch feeder lines*”. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, for example, in the paragraphs starting at page 4, line 11, and starting at page 9, line 22. No new matter is added.

Hershberger discloses a waveguide system comprising feeder waveguide (2) which branches into two branch waveguides (3, 4), where each branch waveguide (3, 4) includes a corresponding slot (7, 8) through which a vane plate (5) can pass into the waveguide. Since the vane (5) is rotatable about shaft (6), then either one of branch waveguides (3, 4) may be selectively blocked by the vane (5). Similar to Vlieststra, Hershberger fails to disclose either “a feeder waveguide that is configured to achieve *point-to-multipoint communication*” or “a plurality of selection structures, wherein each section structure is configured to selectively cut off one of the plurality of branch feeder lines, *independently of the other branch feeder lines*”, as recited in currently amended claim 2. By the present Amendment, the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are now moot.

Claim Rejections 35 U. S. C. § 103 (over Frank et al in view of Vlietstra et al)

Claim 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Frank et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,313) in view of Vlietstra et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,390,355).

Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Frank et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,313) in view of Vlietstra et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,390,355), and further in view of Fathy et al (U.S Patent No. 6,154,176).

Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Frank et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,313) in view of Vlietstra et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,390,355), and further in view of Berman et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,151,489).

Independent claims 1 and 8 are each amended to recite “... a plurality of selection structures, wherein each section structure is configured to selectively cut off one of the plurality of branch feeder lines, *independently of the other branch feeder lines...*”. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, for example, in the paragraphs starting at page 4, line 11, and starting at page 9, line 22. No new matter is added.

As described above, Vlieststra disclose a waveguide switch which can selectively cause electromagnetic energy to flow from the feed waveguide to one of the branch waveguide depending on the position of the conductive vane define by conductive plates in the waveguide switch, ***which cut off the other branch waveguide from received the electromagnetic energy***. Vlieststra fails to describe or suggest “a feeder waveguide that is

configured to achieve *point-to-multipoint communication*", as recited in currently amended claim 1. Indeed, it teaches away from "a plurality of selection structures, wherein each section structure is configured to selectively cut off one of the plurality of branch feeder lines, *independently of the other branch feeder lines*", as recited in currently amended claims 1 and 8.

Frank et al was cited for disclosing other features of a section antenna, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Vlietstra explained above.

Claims 3-7 depend from claim 1, and thus should be patentable for at least the same reasons. Claims 10-14 depend from claim 8, and thus should be patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim Rejections 35 U. S. C. § 103 (over Frank et al in view of Hershberger et al)

Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Frank et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,313) in view of Hershberger et al (U.S. Patent No. 2,415,242).

Independent claims 2 and 9 are amended to recite "... a plurality of selection structures, wherein each section structure is configured to selectively cut off one of the plurality of branch feeder lines, *independently of the other branch feeder lines ...*".

As described above, Hershberger fails to teach or suggest "a feeder waveguide that is configured to achieve *point-to-multipoint communication*", as recited in currently amended claim 2. Indeed, Hershberger also teaches away from "a plurality of selection structures, wherein each section structure is configured to selectively cut off one of the plurality of branch feeder lines, *independently of the other branch feeder lines*", as recited in currently amended claims 2 and 9.

Frank et al were cited for disclosing other features of claims, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Hershberger et al explained above.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 5, 2008

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Thomas J. Belcher Reg. No. 43,438
[Signature] George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072